

Applicant(s): Katarzyna Lejten-Nowak  
Serial No.: 10/525,490  
Filed: February 23, 2005  
For: RECONFIGURABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICE HAVING INTERCONNECTED DATA STORAGE DEVICES  
Art Unit: 2819  
Examiner: Crawford, Jason

Attorney Docket No.: NL020827

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-5 are pending in the present application.

The Action: (1) found allowable subject matter with respect to claims 2-4; (2) requested a preferred layout for the specification; (3) rejected claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,631,577 to Freiden et al. (hereinafter the "'577 patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,332 to Brelet (hereinafter the "'332 patent"); and (4) objected to claims 2-4 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Regarding (1) above, Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the finding of allowable subject matter.

Regarding (2) above, Applicant respectfully declines to revise the specification in accordance with the requested layout as provided by 37 CFR 1.77(b), as such revisions are not required/mandatory (MPEP 608.01(a)).

Regarding items (3) and (4) above, the Action seems to suggest, among other things, that function generator 301 and function generator 302 read on the first and second data storage devices, respectively, of present claim 1. (OA, p.2). In so doing, the Action points out that the '577 patent in fact fails to disclose or suggest a "second data storage device being coupled to [a] first data storage device". (OA, p.3). Further, in an effort to address the noted shortcomings of the '577

Applicant(s): Katarzyna Lejten-Nowak  
Serial No.: 10/525,490  
Filed: February 23, 2005  
For: RECONFIGURABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICE HAVING INTERCONNECTED DATA STORAGE DEVICES  
Art Unit: 2819  
Examiner: Crawford, Jason

Attorney Docket No.: NL020827

patent, the Action cites the '332 patent asserting that such patent inherently discloses, via PORT A and PORT B of Fig. 1, "two storage devices...being coupled together".

In response to the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Fig. 1 of the '332 patent, which figure, Applicant respectfully notes, is described via the '332 specification as being "a block diagram", seems to do nothing more than reflect the fact that PORT A and PORT B have a conventional interrelationship as part of a dual-port RAM 100. Hence, (i) as a retrospective claim of inherency is not a substitute for some teaching or suggestion in the specification that supports the selection and use of the various elements in a particular claim (*See, In re Newell*, 13 USPQ 2d 1248, 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1989)), and (ii) as the '332 specification fails to provide the requisite support, but rather, to the contrary, seems to teach away from the suggested coupling of PORT A and PORT B (*See, e.g., col.6, lns.30-32*), Applicant respectfully submits that the inherency assertions of the Action should not be maintained.

Further, Applicant respectfully notes that the '577 patent, in addition to failing to disclose or suggest a second data storage device being coupled to a first data storage device, as acknowledged in the Action, likewise fails to disclose or suggest a first data storage device being responsive to "a control signal" with a second data storage device responsive to "a further control signal". Rather, in apparent contrast to that which is suggested via the Action, the '577 patent specifically requires that input signals F1-F4, which signals the Action equates to "a control signal", be "used to address *both* function generators in a write cycle" (*emphasis added*) (col.4, lns.55-56).

Applicant(s): Katarzyna Lejten-Nowak  
Serial No.: 10/525,490  
Filed: February 23, 2005  
For: RECONFIGURABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICE HAVING INTERCONNECTED DATA STORAGE DEVICES  
Art Unit: 2819  
Examiner: Crawford, Jason

Attorney Docket No.: NL020827

Hence, at least because the '577 patent seems to teach away from the reference combination suggested by the Action, the obviousness rejection should not be maintained.

Thus, in view of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that notwithstanding that which has been suggested via the Action, present claims 1-5 are each patentable over the cited reference combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the stated rejection of such claims are respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully further requests that, as the present application is in condition for allowance and more particularly as the present claims are clearly patentable over the art of record, entry of this amendment and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



David L. Barnes, Reg. No. 47,407  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510  
Tel: (914) 333-9693  
Fax: (914) 332-0615  
Email: dave.barnes@philips.com  
www.ip.philips.com